



Land Development News

County of San Diego
Department of Public Works
November 2009

Terry Connors, County Surveyor

AB 645 – Niello; Effective January 1, 2010

This bill requires civil, mechanical or electrical engineering plans to contain only the signature, seal or stamping and date of said signing, sealing or stamping.

This bill also eliminates the requirement of an expiration date appearing on the stamp or seal of a Licensed Land Surveyor. To this extent, Final Map Statements have been revised. Please see the language of the bill for specifics.

SB 113 – Committee on Local Government; Effective January 1, 2010

With regard to the Subdivision Map Act - This bill would require a local agency or advisory agency to act to approve or disapprove a lot line adjustment pursuant to the Permit Streamlining Act. The bill would also exempt the leasing of or the granting of an easement to a parcel of land or any portion or portions of the land in conjunction with a biogas project, as specified.

This bill would require that the exterior boundary of the land included within the subdivision not include a parcel that has been designated as a remainder of the subdivision or has been omitted from the subdivision and would require the designated remainder or omitted parcel to be labeled as a designated remainder parcel or omitted parcel.

This bill would require that when a subdivider is required under the act or any other provision of law to make a dedication for specified public purposes on a final map, that the local agency specify whether the dedication is to be in fee for public purposes or an easement for public purposes. The bill would require the subdivider to include certain language in the dedication clause on the final map or any separate instrument.

Theresa Vargas, DPW Land Development Administrative Analyst

When a Developer Deposit project is complete, including all necessary clerical closure activities, the remaining balance is refunded to the client. For current active project closures, a special refund form does not need to be completed for the refund to be processed. If a project has been canceled, withdrawn, or dormant then a written request needs to be submitted so staff can review and determine if the project is eligible for refund.

The refund process normally takes approximately 30 days, but in some unique cases, it may take longer, to ensure that all charges are processed correctly. If the client has a



Land Development News

November 2009

deficit on another Developer Deposit account, regardless of the County Department the account is with, the deficit is paid out of the refund before the balance is refunded to the customer. The refund is only sent to the Financial Responsible on record.

To view the current balances for your Developer Deposit account, please visit <http://projectbalance.sdcounty.ca.gov> and query by Customer Number, Reference Number, or KIVA Project Number. All of these numbers can be found on your statement.

Derek Gade, PDCI DPW LUEG Program Manager

Private Development Construction Inspection – Supervised Grading Reports

Most Department of Public Works grading permits issued require Supervised Grading Reports to be submitted at least monthly by the Permit Compliance Engineer per the County's Grading Ordinance Section 87.420. This requirement will be noted on the first page of the grading plan. During high levels of soil movement, these reports are required weekly. Please take a minute and make sure you are using the most up-to-date form and view the reporting requirements by downloading them at <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/privdel.html>. The form can be downloaded in Word or editable PDF format. These reports may be submitted a number of different ways including via mail, fax, or email per the following:

Mail

DPW - Private Development Construction Inspection
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite D (MS O336)
San Diego, CA 92123-4310

FAX:

(858) 694-2354

Email:

grading@sdcounty.ca.gov

From time to time, we have problems with receiving reports timely, so the above webpage has detailed information on when reports are due.

The rainy season has started, and your input via the Supervised Grading reports is even more helpful to ensure the site remains in compliance. The Permit Compliance Engineer is required to verify the permittee is appropriately implementing Stormwater Best Management Practices and avoiding discharges. Problems identified must be shared with your permittee immediately and action plans must be implemented to address these concerns. The Supervised Grading report should include the permittee's plans to resolve the non-compliance.

If your project has a sediment or chemical discharge from the site, you are required to contact your project inspector within 24 hours. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at (858) 694-3165 or at grading@sdcounty.ca.gov.



Cid Tesoro, DPW Flood Control Program Manager

Improving the Review Process for Flood Control and Water Quality Elements of a Project

A meeting was held on October 9, 2009, to begin the dialog between County and members of the engineering community on ways to improve the review process for flood control and water quality elements of plans. This was the first of many meetings to come. The need to investigate our current practices for plan review was raised at a previous Professional Societies Task Force Committee Meeting. At the meeting on October 9, 2009, some concerns were raised, including:

- There are too many reviews conducted for flood issues
- When is a cursory review sufficient versus a thorough review?
- There needs to be some consistency in the review of computer programs
- How can we streamline the communication between project managers, plan checkers, engineers, and Flood Control Engineering?
- How will changes affect existing policies?
- Engineers and plan checkers need to be educated on the process

We realized that a closer look at our review process is needed. Furthermore, we have to see if there are opportunities to conduct cursory reviews rather than thorough reviews. As a follow-up to this meeting, an internal meeting was held on November 5th with Land Development, Flood Control Engineering, County Counsel, and DPLU to determine what is an acceptable level of drainage/hydrology/floodplain review for CEQA level versus final engineering.

A follow-up meeting was held with Industry representatives on November 9, 2009. At that meeting we discussed the outcome of the November 5th meeting and started discussing possible solutions to the issues above. There will be a few more meetings, and we will announce these in advance to provide Industry with an opportunity to participate.